



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/743,863	01/17/2001	Miki Nagano	108103	9073
25944	7590	12/03/2004	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			KIBLER, VIRGINIA M	
P.O. BOX 19928			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			2623	

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/743,863

Applicant(s)

NAGANO, MIKI

Examiner

Virginia M Kibler

Art Unit

2623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: New claim 14 would require further search.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Summary of Applicant's Argument: Fukunaga does not disclose an image-processing apparatus, wherein each of the image processing sections are capable of being set to one of a first operation mode allowing data communication with a control section, and a second operation mode allowing only reception from the control section.

Fukunaga discloses a master processor element that outputs a synchronization signal so that the other process elements are synchronized (Col. 14, lines 14-45). The only difference between master and the other processor elements as disclosed by Fukunaga is that the master outputs the synchronization signal. Fukunaga does not disclose any other difference between master and the other processor elements regarding communication with a control section. Fukunaga's master/slave relationship is narrowly limited within the context of generating a synchronization signal and has nothing to do with data communication with a control section.

Applicant requests a reference to demonstrate how an alleged "well-known" model for data communication protocol may be applied in Fukunaga's synchronization signal generation and in the current rejection. Applicant further submits that the asserted inherency that a slave has reception only in a master/slave relationship is baseless.

Examiner's Response: Fukunaga discloses a processor element being set as the master (Col. 14, lines 38-45), thereby being set to one of a first operation mode allowing data communication with the control section and the remaining processors being set to a second operation mode allowing only reception from the control section. In Figure 3, Fukunaga depicts rendering processors 4 communicating with control section (Main Processor 10) through bus 16.

Art Unit: 2623

Fukunaga discloses the master processor element outputting a synchronization signal so that the other process elements are synchronized, as indicated by Applicant. However, the claim language does not exclude processors being synchronizers. Furthermore, processors 4-i are rendering processors performing functions indicated in Col. 6, lines 45-61.

Master/slave relationship is a well-known model for communication protocol. The model is not applied in Fukunaga's synchronization signal generation but functions as a rendering processor. As a well-defined technical nomenclature in master/slave arrangement, a slave element is a passive element with only reception capability and is not capable of controlling the master element. Therefore, it is inherent that the slave has reception only in a master/slave relationship.

Contact Information

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Virginia M Kibler whose telephone number is (703) 306-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8:00 - 5:30 and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Virginia Kibler can be reached on (703) 306-4072. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Virginia Kibler
12/02/04

MEHRDAD DASTOURI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

